

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,001	04/26/2001	Toshimichi Kishimoto	520.40043X00	7058
20457	7590 04/21/2005		EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800			SHINGLES, KRISTIE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTO	N, VA 22209-3873	2141		
			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Offic	e Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050412
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su	ımmary (PTO-413)
Attachment(s)		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.
application from the International Bu	, , , ,	and vad
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		received in this National Stage
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in Ap	pplication No
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	g., priority aridor oo ororo. 3	(") (") (").
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eian priority under 35 U.S.C. &	119(a)-(d) or (f).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	,	, , ,
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 December 2004</u>		objected to by the Examiner.
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.	
Application Papers		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	alter de de	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7-20</u> is/are rejected.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	
4) Claim(s) 7-20 is/are pending in the applicat	tion.	
Disposition of Claims		
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>⊑x paπe Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	•	• •
· <u> </u>	This action is non-final.	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2		
Status		
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep. reply within the statutory minimum of thirty riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT atute, cause the application to become ABA	(30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE		NTH(S) FROM
Period for Reply		,
The MAILING DATE of this communication	Kristie Shingles appears on the cover sheet with	2141 h the correspondence address
omeo Action Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit
Office Action Summary	09/842,001	KISHIMOTO ET AL.
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Application No.	A 11 4/->

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-6 are cancelled. Claims 7-20 are new. Claims 7-20 are pending.

Drawings

1. The proposed drawing corrections filed 12/27/2004 have been accepted by the Examiner.

The corrections to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The proposed specification corrections filed 12/27/2004 have been accepted by the Examiner. The corrections to the specification will not be held in abeyance.

Abstract

3. The proposed abstract corrections filed 12/27/2004 have been accepted by the Examiner. The objection is withdrawn. The corrections to the abstract will not be held in abeyance.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

(

Art Unit: 2141

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Peping* (USPN 6,185,655).
 - a. **Per claim** 7, *Peping* teaches a storage operating system comprising:
 - an external storage device having storage data and storage operating data and a service processor for operating said storage operating data (Abstract, col.3 lines 57-67, col.4 lines 3-col.5 line 59, col.9 line 4-col.10 line 19, col.11 lines 3-22 and col.11 line 49-61; provision for external storage, distributed management units, intelligent agents, a centralized management unit for operating and processing the storage operating data; centralized management units also comprise processing for configuring the storage);
 - a host computer coupled with said external storage device via a first connection so as to read/write said storage data from/to said external storage device (Figure 8, col.9 lines 41-59, col.10 lines 32-67 and col.11 lines 3-22); and
 - a storage management server coupled with said host computer via a second connection and said service processor via a third connection (Abstract, Figure 4, col.2 line 53-col.3 line 21, col.5 lines 35-59 and col.10 lines 47-67; server connected to workstations, distributed management units, and network),
 - wherein said storage management server executes a storage operating data server program (col.4 lines 23-66 and col.5 line 7-col.6 line 65; provision of storage operating server program with implementation of the intelligent agent programs), and

Art Unit: 2141

Page 4

- wherein said host computer executes an application program associated with said storage operating data server program so as to read/write said storage operating data (col.3 lines 57-67, col.4 lines 48-66, col.6 line 1-col.7 line 11, col.9 line 4-col.10 line 31 and col.11 line 49-61; provision for read/write abilities with use of intelligent agent programs, distributed management units, and server; centralized management units also comprise processing for configuring the storage).
- b. Claim 14 contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.
- c. **Per claim 8,** *Peping* teaches the storage operating control system according to claim 7, wherein said host computer operates in accordance with said storage operating data which the storage management server reads from said external storage device (col.2 line 50-col.3 line 18, col.3 line 57-col.4 line 55 and col.6 lines 45-65; workstations in communication with the server, wherein the server reads from the external storage).
- d. Claim 15 is substantially equivalent to claim 8 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.
- e. **Per claim 9**, *Peping* teaches the storage operating control system as defined in the claim 7, comprising a switch for shutting off said third connection between said service processor and said storage management server (col.7 lines 37-49; provision for switches interfaced with the distributed management units and centralized management unit).
- f. Claims 10, 16 and 17 are substantially equivalent to claim 9 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

Art Unit: 2141

interface with Internet).

Page 5

- g. **Per claim 11**, *Peping* teaches the storage operating control system as defined in the claim 7, wherein said storage management server comprising a WWW (World Wide Web) terminal connection and a WWW server program to allow access of the storage operating data using the WWW terminal connection (Figure 8 and col.10 lines 47-67; provision for server
- h. Claim 18 is substantially equivalent to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.
- i. **Per claim 12**, *Peping* teaches the storage operating control system as defined in the claim 7, wherein communication between said host computer and said storage management server on said second connection is at least partially conducted using JAVA Remote Method Invocation (RMI) on a transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP) (col.6 lines 13-40 and col.10 lines 47-67; implementation of Virtual JAVA Machine wherein JAVA applications can run in all the units and TCP/IP).
- j. Claims 13, 19 and 20 are substantially similar to claim 12 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2141

8. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Peping*

(USPN 6,185,655) in view of Nusbickel (USPN 6,868,543).

a. Per claims 12 and 13, Peping teaches the storage operating control system as

Page 6

defined in claim 14, yet fails to explicitly teach the limitation using JAVA RMI. However,

Nusbickel discloses use of JAVA RMI for the client server connection along with TCP/IP

communications protocol (col.5 line 57-col.8 line 26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of *Peping* and *Nusbickel* for the purpose of extending

protocol compatibility with JAVA objects; because it would permit remote communication with

other JAVA objects in the network.

b. Claims 19 and 20 are substantially similar to claim 12 and 13 and are therefore

rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

a. Row et al (USPN 5,931,918) disclose a parallel I/O network file server

architecture.

b. Berson (USPN 6,532,459) discloses a system for finding, identifying, tracking,

and correcting person information in diverse databases.

c. Kim et al (USPN 6,842,769) disclose an automatically configured network server.

d. Garrison (USPN 6,275,939) discloses a system and method for securely accessing

a database from a remote location.

e. Regelski et al (USPN 6,738,772) discloses access control system having

automatic download and distribution of security information.

Art Unit: 2141

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles Examiner

Art Unit 2141

kds

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 8